India

FOR THE

No. 143. New Series.] No. 237. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1900. [Registered as a Newspaper.] Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 157
Imperialism "With a Difference"... 160
India and the South African Settlement 160
Our London Letter 162
Notes from Bombay 162
India and the General Election:
The Leader of the Opposition on the Forward Policy 163
Professor Murison in Glasgow ... 164
Lord G. Hamilton's Address ... 164
The Famine in India:
3,537,000 on Relief 164
The Mansion House Fund 164
Mr. Romesh Dutt on Over-Assessments 164
Some Opinions of the Press... ... 165
Revenue Collections in Guzarat ... 166
Advertisements 168

NOTES AND NEWS.

Lord Curzon's telegram of Monday last reported that a good general rainfall continued in the famine districts though the fall was insufficient in a few areas in Bombay. In other parts—such is the change which has lately occurred—fine weather generally is wanted for the ripening of the autumn and the sowing of the winter crops. Lord Curzon reports a further reduction in the number on relief works—the total figures are returned at 3,537,000—and adds that prices are falling slowly everywhere. Lord Northcote's telegram states that in the week ending September 15 there were in British districts 702 cases of cholera and 497 deaths, while in the Native States there were 1,427 cases and 1,028 deaths. The total number of deaths during the week among the numbers on relief works and gratuitous relief was 3,589. Lord Northcote says that rain has continued to fall in light showers over the affected area, but that more rain is urgently wanted throughout Bombay, the Deccan, and Khandesh. There is nothing in all this to warrant a cessation of public or private contributions to the relief funds.

Our Bombay Correspondent, in the article which appears on another page, refers to a hint dropped in the Legislative Council that another Famine Commission will be appointed at the close of the present famine. Lord George Hamilton, it may be remembered, made a reference to this matter in his speech on the Indian Budget on July 26 last (India, August 3, p. 66). Having mentioned the exceptionally high mortality in Gujerat during the present famine, he added:—

> Whenever operations are over it has been the practice to appoint a Commission of Enquiry to investigate the various methods adopted. We shall have recourse to this procedure when this famine is over, and I hope that the collection of facts and the expression of opinions may be of use to the officials of the locality in dealing with subsequent outbreaks.

The passage is characteristic both for the complacent assumption that there are to be more famines in India, and for the intimation that the proposed Commission is to deal only with methods of relief. That is what the last Famine Commission did, though Lord George Hamilton had held out the hope that it would also enquire into possible means of preventing famines. No doubt, as this famine has shown, especially in Bombay, the relief system is still capable of much improvement. But the fundamental problem, as our Bombay Correspondent points out, is the prevention of famine. To this end searching enquiry is needed. Why do the authorities shun enquiry of the kind? Can it be that they fear disclosures as to the terrible and increasing poverty of the mass of the Indian people?

That excellent journal, the *Indu-Prakash*, (September 3), calls attention to a new way of recovering land revenue.

> We have before us (it writes) a copy of an order from the Mamlatdar of Taluka, M——, District Thanna, informing Mr——, a landholder of the place, that as he had not paid the Government dues on the lands owned by him, the Collector and District Magistrate had been pleased to withdraw the licence to keep arms which had been granted to him. As a matter of fact, the gentleman who was thus condemned and punished had committed no fault whatsoever. He had to pay two instalments, one of which had been duly paid, and the other was not due when this order came to him. He therefore humbly submitted that he was no defaulter and that he would pay the second instalment when it became due. If in spite of that the Collector was pleased to withdraw his licence he may so please himself.

In the end the licence was not withdrawn. But the *Indu-Prakash* "cannot help admiring the ingenuity of the revenue authorities in discovering novel methods of enforcing revenue payments." Still it thinks threats of the kind are "irregularities, if not positive illegalities, and they throw a vivid light on the protestations of innocence that are so often put forward on behalf of the proverbially stringent and unbending Bombay land revenue recovery system."

Mr. B. K. Bose in tracing the relation between the impoverishment of the cultivators in the Central Provinces and the decay of rural industries, is keenly alive to the difficulties of a revival. He is praised by the *Friend of India* for his readiness to look facts in the face. India cannot resort to a protective tariff, though the self-governing British Colonists may. And small local industries, the result of special efforts, are a poor recompense for the loss of such great industries as spinning and weaving. Mr. Bose strongly supports the establishment of rural banks, though he believes it is only necessary to train the people in habits of prudence. It is probable that to replace the private money-lender by rural Banks would be of more benefit to the peasantry than artificial restraints on the sale and alienation of the land.

The *Mahratta* draws attention to the great expense of plague. Even if there were no famine, this would be serious. How much more when famine is also present. The charge on account of plague establishment for twelve months in the Bombay Presidency alone amounts to 5,34,624 rupees at 44,552 rupees per month. But this is the cost when the plague is low. The whole cost of the plague during the year under all heads is 13,96,000 rupees—or as much as the expenditure under the following heads: Permanent Civil Medical Establishment, Government Hospitals and Lunatic Asylums; Contributions to Municipal Dispensaries, Sanitary and Vaccination Department, Grants in Aid to Village Sanitation Committees, the Grant Medical College, the three Medical Schools, and the Office of the Chemical Analyser to the Government. And all this is quite apart from the plague expenditure forced on the Municipal bodies. The *Mahratta* protests against the cost of the Plague Research Laboratory being charged to the Province. It is surely not a Provincial matter.

The *Hindu* does good service in pressing once again on the attention of its readers the connexion between the high price of salt and the low state of the public health. It has been well said: "Wherever the consumption of salt falls below 20lb. per inhabitant it is bad for the public health." Mr. Mulhall, who had lived in South America, reported that "during the Paraguayan war of 1864-70, it was observed that the men who had been without salt for three months, when wounded, however slightly, died, as their wounds would not heal." In ten of the chief nations of Europe and America the consumption of salt was greatest in the United Kingdom, being there 72lb. per head., compared with 18lb. in Austria, where it was lowest; but in India it was at the same time only 12lb. per head. But the heavy cost is in India the real difficulty—a heavy cost due entirely to the financial difficulties of the Government.

In fact, it may be asked, in view of the heavy revenue derived from salt and the heavy expenditure on plague, whether the Indian Government are not moving in a vicious circle, taking more or less ineffective measures to cope with a sudden epidemic at the expense of the general

health of the people, the maintenance of which can alone enable them to cope with the plague in the future. However, it is not necessary to press this argument far, since there are much more unjustifiable sources of expenditure in India than any caused by measures of plague prevention. But how is it possible to be satisfied, as Lord George Hamilton appears to be, with the state of Indian finance when a considerable revenue is derived from salt at the expense of the health of the people?

Lord George Hamilton's election address is a characteristic production. It is marked by that optimism which is natural in a man who has for years been receiving a large salary for little work, and of course there is no particular reason why the electors of the Ealing Division should object to his lordship's continuing to receive his £5,000 a year seeing that they pay not one penny of it. There is but one direct reference in the address to the country which daily loads Lord George with benefits, and that is contained in an allusion to "the dash and determination of our Indian troops in the Far East." There is no word about the famine, either as to the necessity for some enquiry into its causes, so as to prevent, if possible, any repetition, or as to the duty of this country to make a national free grant. One can hardly suppose that the reference to the "many burdens" which a "great external Empire" places upon the shoulders of the English people is intended to allude to India. For the less that is said about burdens in that connexion the better, seeing that even the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, after being packed with officials, found that we were overcharging India to the extent of £250,000 a year. Nor can anyone be more conscious than Lord George of the fact that there is one burden connected with external Empire which does not fall on the shoulders of the English people—and that is his lordship's handsome salary, as well as all the very heavy expenses of the India Office. The overtaxed and underfed people of India bear that burden.

But while Lord George Hamilton has nothing to say bout Indian affairs he shows that he has not forgotten candid declaration made when this Government came in. He then said that the object of his party was to "safeguard the interests of its friends," and in this account of his stewardship Lord George remarks rather blandly, "since 1895 much useful legislation has been passed benefiting many sections of society." No one will dispute the accuracy of this; indeed this is just where his lordship's "friends" have come in. The Church parson, the Church school, the landlord both in Great Britain and in Ireland, and a few other favoured cliques, or as he calls them, "sections of society," have reason to rise up and call Lord George blessed. They have had their reward, and he invokes their gratitude though that reward cost him nothing.

Monday is the first of October, but we have as yet no Ministerial pronouncement on the adjourned question of a national grant towards the relief of famine in India. The *Morning Leader* yesterday (Thursday) summed up the matter as follows:—

Indian troops are fighting our battles just now in China. Indian bearers carried our wounded soldiers out of range of the Boer bullets on the battlefields of Natal. The wealthy in India have contributed largely to the patriotic funds for the orphans and widows of the men who have fallen in South Africa. Meantime what are we doing for India? The most terrible famine of modern times is still raging in our greatest dependency. Six millions of our fellow-subjects have been officially classed as starving. The Government has repeatedly refused to make them even the smallest grant from the Imperial Exchequer. One penny will keep a man alive for a day. Three and a half millions sterling would keep alive all of these starving men, women, and children for five months. We had nothing to spare for this purpose. Why? Because we are spending yearly almost this same sum in doles to the classes which elected this Unionist Government. We give £8 a year apiece on an average to 11,000 clergy, over a million and a half to the English landlords, three-quarters of a million to Irish landlords, and over half a million to the subscribers to sectarian schools. The Unionists have spent every year in making the wealthy yet wealthier the sum that they could not afford once on an emergency to keep millions of Indians alive.

We are glad to see that Mr. Balfour is being "heckled" on the question in Manchester.

In the election addresses of the chief Unionist leaders nothing has been more strongly insisted on than the fact that the issue now before the country is above all things an Imperial issue. Yet neither Lord Salisbury, nor Mr. Balfour, nor Mr. Chamberlain make even the vaguest passing reference to India! They can talk in after-dinner perorations about India being the brightest jewel in the British Crown, but when the banquet is over they forget her. It is not long since a leading British politician declared that if England were to lose all her colonies the calamity would be great but not overwhelming, but that if she were to lose India the sun of her Imperial splendour would have set. Yet these Imperialists when fighting an avowedly "Imperial" General Election cannot spare one syllable to her affairs.

It is no doubt natural that South Africa should be just now the burden of their song, for Mr. Chamberlain has managed to waste a hundred millions in treasure, and to sacrifice 40,000 British lives in that part of the world. But how many millions of our fellow-subjects have needlessly perished in India? Yet all enquiry into the causes of the famine, all enquiries directed to the prevention of recurring famines, have been rejected. Nay more, the Government have in spite of the remonstrances of their supporters in Parliament and in the Press, in spite even of the urging of papers like the *Times* and the *Standard*, papers not likely to go to extremes in friendly suggestions on behalf of the people of India, stubbornly refused to allow a national grant to be voted for the assistance of India in the time of her sore trial. And yet these men call themselves Imperialists!

The effects of the Rangoon case still appear. We learn from the *Times of India* that the following new paragraph has been added to the Army Regulations of India, Vol. II, section 6, para. 288 (*a*):—

The following procedure will be observed for dealing with cases of assaults by British soldiers for injury by the latter:—When a serious assault has been committed by British soldiers on a Native of India, resulting in death or serious injury to the latter, or when a serious assault has been committed by British soldiers on a Native of India, whether the latter is connected with troops or not, and including the case in which a reasonable assumption exists that the assailant is British, immediate information of all facts, so far as is known, together with a copy of the complaint, if any, shall be given by the local military authority, ordinarily the Commanding Officer, to the civil authorities. The military authority concerned will at the same time commence a thorough and searching investigation in view of securing on the spot, and when the event is fresh, the best possible narrative thereof. When the civil authorities take up the case the military authorities shall render them every assistance possible in their investigation. Regimental officers in conducting the investigations of these cases will communicate with the magistrate of the district as freely as necessities of each case would require. The medical officer who first attends the injured Native will bring to the notice of the military authorities concerned, with the least possible delay, the nature and extent of the injuries received and the probable and ultimate result thereof.

This is an eminently proper Regulation. In order to see in what respects there has hitherto been laxity one has only to examine the rules here laid down for the future. We hope that the new Regulation will be useful both in securing the punishment of offenders and—what is of far greater importance—in preventing offences.

The *Pioneer*, while affirming the general quietness of the North-West frontier, admits that that portion which marches with Waziristan is an exception. In the old times the whole tribe gained something by plunder. In consideration of their abstaining from loot, the Indian Government makes an allowance which to the Mahsuds alone amounts to Rs. 60,000 *per annum*. But this all goes to the head men of the tribe, and the "poorer ruffians," who before got some small pickings of loot, get nothing at all now. Hence a considerable amount of discontent and a readiness to defy the chiefs and resume the habit of looting. The *Pioneer* considers at some length what is the proper remedy for this evil, and discusses the relative advantages of (1) a punitive expedition; (2) a surprise party; and (3) a blockade.

Not so very long ago a punitive expedition would have been looked on as the only proper and dignified way of stopping such raids. But in view of the new policy inaugurated by Lord Curzon, men are beginning to count the cost. The *Pioneer*, which has long been opposed to a policy of adventure on the frontier, thus sums up the situation:—

Doubtless if a blow has to be struck against any tribe, or

group of tribes, it will be struck in due season, and struck with a heavy hand; but there is a sensible reluctance to play the game of marching brigades in and out of the hill-country in pursuit of an enemy who will never risk more than a petty skirmish. This game is not worth the candle.

This is sound sense, which it is comforting to find at last prevailing.

One objection which applies to both punitive expeditions and surprise parties is that they do not touch the real criminals. The baser sort plunder on the trade routes, while the *maliks* are satisfied with the Government allowance. But in a punitive expedition—

an army marches into the Waziri country, burns and destroys the property of those who have property, seizes flocks and herds, kills a few men, and—marches out again! The ruffians who have caused all this pother are not touched—they skulk about in the hills and jeer at the discomfiture of the unfortunate *maliks*.

In the case of surprise parties, given success—and they are not always successful—only an isolated effect is produced, "and this at the cost of increased irritation and dislike against us."

For these reasons the *Pioneer* decides that if action is necessary, blockade is the most effective means of bringing a tribe to its senses:—

When the Waziris found that this meant no salt, no sale of wood, hides, or wool, no labour and good wages all the winter, they would realise that the tribe as a whole was interested in the matter. . . . They would have to pay enhanced prices, perhaps cent. per cent., for everything; and the sale of their produce would be entirely stopped for a while. A strict blockade would make the tribe bankrupt in two months.

Punitive expeditions, in the opinion of the *Pioneer*, should be reserved for cases in which the whole tribe, *maliks* included, have offended.

The *Times of India* recurs to the subject of confessions extorted from prisoners by the police under threats of torture or even under its actual infliction:—

It is a truism of experience in criminal law in India that police torture is a frequent adjunct of difficult police investigations. It is useless to blink the truth—either it is or it is not the fact that the police frequently torture, or threaten with torture, suspected criminals.

It is no answer to this indictment to draw attention to the excellent or even heroic work of the police in plague and famine. Our contemporary goes on:—

Any Judge of experience must have been struck with the wonderful unanimity with which prisoners in dacoity cases confess before the lower magistracy—in other words, while still in the custody, and therefore in the temporarily uncontrolled power, of the subordinate police—and the equally wonderful unanimity with which when brought before the Sessions Court they retract these confessions.

Nor does the absence of marks of ill-treatment prove that a confession was voluntary; for the "true artist does not have recourse to clumsy methods which leave evident traces."

A recent decision of the Bombay High Court has reopened the whole question. The English Judge laid it down some two or three years ago that "where a prisoner retracts a former confession, when pleading at the final trial, the judge is *ipso facto* put upon enquiry as to the voluntariness of that confession," and the prisoner is entitled to a favourable presumption till the contrary is proved. This eminently reasonable ruling is now held not to apply in India, though the prevalence of extorted confessions renders it more necessary there than even in England. Englishmen boast of the rule of justice which they have established in their great Eastern dependency. But if we leave the old methods of the police untouched while supporting them with far greater power, where is the gain to the Indians?

To the arbitrary treatment of Indian municipalities we have now grown so accustomed that the letter of "A Resident of Agra" which appears in the *Pioneer* will probably attract little attention. The Government recently ordered the number of members of the Agra municipality to be reduced from twenty-four to sixteen. The selection of the members who were to retire was left entirely to the chairman, who removed four out of the six members of the most populous ward, thus leaving that ward with only tw[illegible]embers, while two smaller wards retained three each, th[illegible]ull number. The men thus chosen for expulsion were among the most attentive to their duties, and included the only European ever elected in Agra. The "Resident of Agra" thus concludes:—

I do not grumble at the Government reserving to themselves the power to reduce or increase the number of Municipal Commissioners, but I contend that it is the duty of Government to see that the power is not prostituted to enable chairmen to stifle all public opinion and bring discredit on the name of local self-government.

Lord Curzon lately complained of the great amount of money required for the Assam-Bengal railway and of the unprofitable nature of railways in Assam. At a recent meeting of the Assam Branch of the Indian Tea Association, Mr. Buckingham, the chairman, offered some criticism on these remarks. According to him, the alignment of the new railway was chosen for political rather than commercial reasons, and had the line been commenced from Bengal, instead of Assam, there would have been a great saving in cost of carriage, and there would not have been "the fearful rate of mortality which accompanies opening out tracts like the Nambar Forest with unacclimatised labour." Mr. Buckingham insists that as the line has been made chiefly "for political and Imperial convenience," Assam should not be charged with the cost of construction. The *Pioneer*, on the contrary, alleges that the line as now made is essentially that desired by the tea-planting interest in the years 1883-1886.

The *African Review* makes the disquieting announcement that "two important South African houses are turning their attention to the goldfields of India." This is grim intelligence indeed, and may well cause alarm even in a land inured to suffering by such disasters as war, pestilence and famine. It is said that promising accounts have been received from the mineral areas controlled by the Hyderabad (Deccan) Co., and there seems to be some real danger that the men whose greed for gold has turned South Africa into a shambles will before long descend upon India. Well may the *Champion* describe this as "a fresh terror for India," and ask what enormity India can have committed to attract the attention of the men who have covered Africa with ruined homes.

In connexion with this threatened move the *African Review* indulges in the usual complacent talk about the blessings which will result from the "gravitation of capital" to India. If the "blessings" alluded to are the big dividends to be made by those who are lusting after the exploitation of India, perhaps the paper which expresses the views of the South African millionaires is justified in its predictions, and perhaps not, for we know nothing about the commercial merits of the scheme. But one thing is certain—the Native worker will not benefit. The men who have in South Africa been discussing the importation of Chinese labour because the haughty Kaffir does not like to work for less than two-pence a day would no doubt grind down the Indian labourers to so low a point as to astonish even those whose lot is never far removed from starvation.

An important and exhaustive work will shortly (writes a correspondent) be brought out containing the thoughts of some of the most eminent leaders of Indian public opinion. It will contain papers written specially by Hindu, Mahometan and Christian representatives of modern Indian thought on the Progress of Indian—chiefly Hindu—Society. It will contain a collection of addresses on various questions of social reform delivered by Mr. Justice Ranade and other eminent Hindus at the annual Social Conferences. There will be an introduction by Mr. Justice Ranade, whose deliverances year after year on social topics are so well known.

Remittances on India for 20 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications for Rs. 4,90,95,058 in bills were received at 1s. $3\frac{15}{16}$d. and 1s. $3\frac{31}{32}$d. The following amounts in bills were allotted, viz.: Rs. 13,26,000 on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 3·938d., Rs. 1,33,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3·937d., and Rs. 5,41,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3·950d. Tenders at 1s. $3\frac{15}{16}$d. will receive about 3 per cent. Later the Council sold bills for four lakhs on Madras at 1s. $3\frac{31}{32}$d. Last week remittances for Rs. 21,24,214 were sold for £141,123, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 6,10,36,894, producing £4,060,270. Next week 20 lakhs will again be offered.

IMPERIALISM "WITH A DIFFERENCE."

IN the early decades of the Nineteenth Century the inauguration of a new Review by a famous publishing house would have been an event of first-rate political importance. Times have changed, and the appearance of the first number of Mr. John Murray's *Monthly Review* on the eve of a General Election may excite only languid interest. Yet there are circumstances at this moment which might conceivably give to the event more importance than appears at first sight, and it would be a mistake to treat the interest of the affair as purely academic.

For possibly the first time in its history the English Liberal party finds itself on the brink of a General Election with principles, aims, policy and leadership all uncertain. The Conservative party has indeed always an advantage over its political rivals in this matter. The principle of keeping the constitution intact needs little revision and is in no danger of being applied inconsistently in different directions. For the rest, the business of politics seems to resolve itself into retaining the support of different classes of voters by tangible concessions to their several interests. But the Liberal party suffers from the constant disadvantage of being under the necessity of applying its principles to changed circumstances. Those who agree in thinking that the world as they find it is not the best possible (the potential members of the Liberal party), may agree about nothing else. Progress is wanted—but in what directions? Here at once we are brought face to face with the necessity for strong leadership—for men who see clearly the application to existing circumstances of the great ideal principles of justice, humanity, brotherhood, and the like, the aspirations to which the heart of every one who is potentially a Liberal responds.

The want of men who, seeing these things clearly, have the power of impressing their own convictions upon the people is admitted by every thoughtful observer. It is this fact which makes it an imperative duty, even in the excitement of an election, to look beyond the immediate present and to test points at issue in the light of broad principles. That is why such articles as the three which open the *Monthly Review*, "The Paradox of Imperialism," "After Pekin," and "Principles and Parties," are to be welcomed. In this age of the daily newspaper we all live too much from hand to mouth in our politics. It may be this very fact that has brought the Liberal party to its present pass. Let us see what its friendly advisers in the new Review have to say.

The gist of the first article is an appeal to Liberals not to be afraid of the word "Imperialism." We must do the writers in the *Monthly Review* the justice of admitting that they have no sympathy with what they themselves call the "blatant Jingoism" of "well-known organs of public opinion." They do not hesitate to speak of this tone as "highly repulsive," and at the same time to admit that it represented a large body of English public opinion—that it was to be found everywhere a few months ago—"in the speeches of public men, in the conversation of the clubs, and in the songs of the music-hall." But the writer of the first article thinks that he has discovered that the antipathy of Liberals to "Imperialism" rests merely on a confusion of ideas. Liberals, it seems, are misled by the fact of the word "empire" standing for two totally different things: the military despotism of an emperor, a Napoleon or a Czar, and the "world-wide concentration of peoples" that constituted the Roman, and now constitutes the British, Empire. Of the two ideas connoted by the word "Imperialism," military despotism and denationalisation, the first, we are told, is "something that every Liberal must denounce," the second "something which all lovers of peaceful progress must sigh for."

There is no process more useful for the politician who wishes conscientiously to clarify his ideas than the Socratic process of definition. We owe thanks to the reviewer for having set us so excellent an example. But his analysis has hardly gone far enough. We hope and believe he will find that the objection of Liberals to "that hated word" rests on something deeper than a mere confusion of ideas. For one thing, the enlightened Liberal has learnt—he has indeed sat in vain at the feet of Mr. Gladstone or of such historians as the late Edward Freeman if he has not learnt it—that "denationalisation" is not "something which all lovers of peaceful progress must sigh for." He may possibly have read the history of the Roman Empire as well as the reviewer. He may know, with Coleridge, that one main cause of the declension of the Roman Empire was "the imperial character overlaying and finally destroying the national." He may feel that municipal interests never could and never can take the place of national. He may know how utterly the efforts of the Roman government to rouse interest in municipal affairs failed—how force had to be applied to compel men to serve on town councils, and how citizens fled from their towns to escape the burden of civic duties and were dragged remorselessly back. There is no more pathetic spectacle in human history than the spectacle of well-intentioned Roman Imperialism and its failure. It is curious, by the way, with what persistence English Imperialists fasten upon the likeness to the Roman Empire and ignore the obvious lesson. The *Spectator* awhile ago reprinted Rutilius's panegyric on Rome as applicable to modern England, and called in the aid of a distinguished scholar to translate it for its readers. When Rutilius lived the handwriting was already upon the wall. The Roman Empire perished partly because of the dying out of national life, partly because of the intolerable expense of government. If the English Empire is not to perish in the same way, care must be taken to foster a healthy national life in every one of the peoples brought together within its borders, and to see that the expenses of government are kept within the limits of sound finance. Where are the English Imperialists who have a grasp of these two elementary principles?

"The true line of cleavage between our parties," says another of our advisers in the *Monthly Review*, "relates to home affairs." If principles are worth anything, they must be worth applying to foreign and colonial policy as well as to domestic. We devoutly hope that no attempt will be made to confine the attention of the English democracy to its own internal concerns. It is the good side of that awakening of interest in "the expansion of England," which has had so many less pleasing aspects, that the democracy, the newspapers, and even Parliament, have begun to realise that what concerns India, for instance, concerns England. Let Liberal statesmen apply Liberal principles, rationally but fearlessly, to the government of the whole Empire. In one sense we are all "Imperialists," and we may resent the action of one party in first monopolising and then perverting the word. We may agree with a writer in the *Fortnightly Review* that the real distinction is between "Imperialism with swagger" and "Imperialism with a difference." Only let that "difference" be clearly defined. Let it be seen that the "difference" implies a sympathetic treatment of the governed, an avoidance of aggression, a resolute determination to shun the paths that lead to national bankruptcy. We do not find this "difference" so clearly defined in either Review as we should like to see it.

INDIA AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN SETTLEMENT.

THERE are three several ways in which India is vitally interested in the Settlement that follows the South African War: (1) as a constituent part of the British Empire; (2) as a Province the liberties of [illegible]ich must of necessity vary with the spread of li[illegible], or arbitrary government, of peaceful or warlike manners in

the other parts of the Queen's dominions; and (3) as a country which has sent forth numerous colonists to Africa —colonists who have had much to complain of in their past treatment, and are eagerly scanning the future to see if it holds out any hope of amelioration. It is true that, although India is a constituent part of the Empire, it is not likely that Indian interests will be much considered in any settlement that may be arrived at. In a more vital matter, the question of a national grant in aid of the famine-stricken, the public opinion not merely of India, but of England also, has been flouted and set at nought. Nevertheless, it is well that Indians should ask themselves in what way they will be affected by the new era opening in Africa.

And first, what will be the effect on India as a part of the Empire? Will that be more glorious, more powerful, and more beneficent? The immediate prospect set before us by our rulers is that of two conquered States, already harried by fire and sword, seething with the bitter discontent of the vanquished, needing a vast garrison to maintain order, deprived of all constitutional government, and administered partly by soldiers and partly by bitter partisans from the Cape. This may add to our glory; but it will certainly fail to add to our power, and however beneficent arbitrary government may be in South Africa, its expense will certainly make it more difficult for England to deal justly—we will not say generously—with India. For a generation a great army will be locked up in Africa, and this will have to be paid by the Empire. To judge from their past conduct, the self-governing Colonies will refuse to pay, the West Indies cannot, and so the United Kingdom will have to bear the whole cost, with such help as can be obtained from the poverty of India. Can it be doubted that this is a state of affairs which will render England more deaf than ever to the appeals of the Indian taxpayer for justice? And will it add to the glory of the Empire so to increase the number of its unwilling subjects, and, laying aside all its traditions as the supporter of freedom throughout the world, to be the first to extinguish a civilised nation since Russia, Austria and Prussia, one hundred and seven years ago, carried out the partition of Poland?

But (2) not only does India suffer with the Empire, but as a subject Province it is dependent in great measure for its liberty and prosperity on the ideals which prevail in the ruling country. If the principles of freedom are there held in honour, Indians may hope that their share in the government of their own land will steadily increase; and if economy and sound finance are popular in England, they will have the better chance of prevailing in India. On the other hand, the more Militarism spreads in England, the less easy will it be to keep it within bounds in the East; and the greater the inclination to arbitrary methods in the one country, the greater will it be in the other. But England is now to undertake, in the wake of a great war, the military administration of two conquered countries; South Africa is to become a school in which arbitrary government will be taught; and the public mind of England is to be rendered callous by this spectacle to infringements of civil liberty and the abolition of popular rights.

The most direct way, however, in which the settlement will affect Indians will be (3) in its influence on the laws under which those of them who are domiciled in South Africa will live. We shall be told, and at first sight it may appear, that by ceasing to be aliens in the Transvaal they will obtain the advantage of equal laws. If we are to believe our high-flying Imperialists, every extension of the Empire gives its citizens a larger field for their energies and a greater territory in which they can feel at home. Unfortunately, facts do not always bear this out. In m[illegible]spects the Indian is treated as an alien in his own country, and in many of the colonies he is treated almost as an enemy. Legislation attempts to keep him out, and if in spite of this he succeeds in entering, the law shackles his industry and interferes with his movements. The cry in the earlier days of the war was "equal rights for all *white* men"; and this is not held in South Africa to include the Indians, though they be of Aryan stock. Now we hear little of equal rights even for all white men, but much of the need of military law until such time as the people of the Republics are reconciled to the loss of their independence—that is, until such time as they can forget the circumstances under which they lost it, and the harshness of the penalty exacted from them. Equal rights have come to mean an equal loss of rights for all races. The equality is to be an equality of servitude.

It is perfectly true that the Indians had grievances under the laws of the Transvaal. But these grievances were no heavier than those from which they suffered in the British Colony of Natal, or under the rule of the Chartered Company in Rhodesia. The tender heart of the Secretary of State for War was, we know from his own lips, more touched by the sufferings inflicted on his Indian fellow-subjects than by all the other iniquities of the Government of President Kruger. And it is curious to note that the Marquis of Lansdowne appears to have ignored the very same wrongs when inflicted on Indians in British territory. Indeed, the wrongs which they suffered in Natal were worse; for while in both cases the law made Indians subject to enforced residence in special locations, this was only threatened in Johannesburg, while it was actually carried out in Natal. It may, indeed, be that the Indians of that Colony may gain some advantage from the war—not so much from the British victory or the settlement which is now promised, as from the valour they displayed on the field of battle in succouring the wounded. Already there are signs of some improvement in the tone of public writers in Natal towards the Indian question, some recognition of the sterling qualities of their Indian fellow-subjects, perhaps even some tardy shame and regret for the ill-usage and the contumely of the past. It is to be hoped that, whatever is forgotten after the war is over, this lesson will not be forgotten; and that the new feelings of brotherhood aroused by Indian valour will bear their fruit in the repeal of oppressive laws.

There is, however, one argument in favour of the proposed settlement as it affects the Indians which must be considered. It is admitted that the legislation of Natal bore hardly on them. But it is said that no one dares interfere with a free and self-governing colony lest the tender plant of colonial loyalty should wither away. The Empire is too loose an organism, or rather has too little real organic connexion between its parts, to make any opposition to colonial prejudices a wise or even a safe policy for the Home Government to pursue. But it is argued that under a Crown Colony, to which the government of the Orange State and the Transvaal is for some time to approximate, the necessity for bowing to local public opinion or respecting local prejudice will not exist. Unfortunately for this view, there is on the border of the Transvaal and Natal a Crown Colony in which the Indians have had just cause of complaint. In Zululand the rule under which no man of colour can purchase certain lands is enforced against Indians, however upright and industrious they may be. Why, then, if the Indians cannot obtain fair and equal treatment in the Crown Colony of Zululand, should they hope to get it any more in the new provinces that are to be erected out of the ruin of the Republics?

It is unnecessary to insist on the great loss to the Indians of South Africa, who as a community are largely interested in retail trading, of a state of suspicion and smothered discontent; or to point out how such a state is

a necessary result of terms which are not only hard in themselves but are to be imposed on the vanquished not as the result of a treaty with the authorities of the defeated nation but solely by the will and power of the conqueror. A matter equally serious arises from the peculiar strength of the great capitalists in South Africa. In Kimberley, since it has come entirely under the power of the great mine-owners, the native labourers have been shut up in compounds and supplied with the necessaries of life by the mining companies. The retail trade of the town has shrivelled almost to nothing. If the same arrangements are introduced into Johannesburg the same effects will follow. Retail trade will decay; and the Indian trader's will find their occupation gone. The little finger of Mr. Rhodes will be thicker than President Kruger's thigh. Thus, indirectly, the Indians will share with the European and the native labourer the fatal effects of the domination of the new capitalism, and the Indian trader in the loss of his trade will see the effects of the fall of wages which the masters of the situation have foretold as the most certain result of this just, necessary, and glorious war. It is not a cheerful prospect, and it behoves all who have influence in the matter to do their best to modify its sinister features.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

HAS vaulting ambition over-leaped itself? Signs of doubt and apprehension on the one hand, of hope and gathering courage on the other, are visible in the speeches of rival candidates. One short week ago the Ministerialists were all self-confidence and their opponents all dejection. To adopt Lord Spencer's happy phrase, we had on the one side optimism *in excelsis*, and on the other despondency *de profundis*. While the parts can scarcely be said to have been reversed, it is certainly the case that the Tories are no longer cocksure and that the Liberals have made an astonishing rally from their unreasonable prostration. Parliamentary politicians are, perhaps, a little too prone at times to gauge popular feeling by the relative strength of parties in the House of Commons. Liberalism in Parliament has been moribund for the last five years, and consequently our sapient statesmen have got into the way of regarding it as quite a negligeable, if not a minus, quantity. They had forgotten one thing—the possible existence of an extra-Parliamentary Liberalism.

Few election contests have been so fruitful in surprises. Last Monday, for example, the crop produced a glut in the market. One had scarcely time to recover from the shock of Lord Salisbury's penitential appeal before the resignation of Mr. Goschen came to renew the wonder. Lord Rosebery's vigorous onslaught on the feeblest Government of modern times was reinforced by the return of Lord Durham to the Liberal fold. In one part of the morning's paper we were able to read the speech in which Mr. Chamberlain had revelled in a debauch of misrepresentation and Chauvinism, and in another part the pensive utterance in which the Duke of Devonshire, after expressly disclaiming sympathy with the khaki issue, had hinted at his approaching retirement. As the week began, so it has continued. There have not been so many symptoms of Conservative revolt, nor, indeed, so many Conservative defections since 1880. Lord Sandwich has imitated the example of Lord Durham, while a son of Lord Knutsford who sat in the last Parliament as a Tory has just come forward as Liberal candidate for Romford.

These are the symptoms partly of a Conservative revolt against the threatened Chamberlain dictatorship, partly of a Liberal Unionist reaction against the fossilised Toryism of Lord Salisbury. Will the fissure widen? The Prime Minister thinks it will. Noting the indifference of the electorate to the khaki cry, he has issued a pathetic remonstrance against the apathy of his supporters. Between every line of this so-called manifesto one can read the self-reproaches of a well-meaning but infirm man. He has consented to the dissolution against his better judgment, and he trembles for the consequences. Is not Mr. Goschen's resignation simply a more decided manifestation of the same feeling? The Duke of Devonshire, in spite of himself, has likewise betrayed his disgust at the manœuvre. Even Mr. Balfour finds it necessary to seek relief from the khaki issue in the scarcely more attractive field of domestic politics. Mr. Chamberlain alone, having mesmerised his colleagues into acquiescence, waves the Union Jack with a will and meets the popular outcry about Old Age Pensions with a blithe suggestion that somebody should "Tip us 'Rule Britannia.'"

Some doubt exists as to whether Mr. Goschen intends to retain office under Lord Salisbury—in the event, that is to say, of a Unionist victory. If he does a seat will have to be found for him in the House of Lords. But whatever happens that contingency is certain. Mr. Goschen has long been marked out for a peerage. Probably enough he will be accompanied to the House of Lords by Sir Matthew White Ridley. Cabinet reconstruction will involve several consolations of this kind. It is almost a pity that Lord Lansdowne is already a marquis. Short of making him a duke it is difficult to see how this self-complacent Minister is to be recompensed for his inevitable deprivation of the War Office portfolio. As Lord Salisbury is a humorist he will probably get over the difficulty by inviting Lord Lansdowne to do for the navy what he has already so successfully accomplished for the army.

Readers will examine the addresses of Ministers in vain for any allusion to affairs in India. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman devotes a section of his luminous and statesmanlike manifesto to this not inconsiderable portion of the British Empire, but in that respect he is peculiar. One might have thought that the Secretary of State would have had something to say on the subject. Not a bit of it. Like his colleagues, Lord George Hamilton is too much engrossed in the splendours of the South African conquest to afford a thought to stricken India. Perhaps, however, this is overstating the extent of Ministerial negligence. Lord George does, after all, consecrate a sentence, or part of a sentence, to the honour of India. Here it is: "Whilst in the Far East the dash and determination of our Indian troops have once more made known to the world the fighting power and resources which the loyalty and courage of that great dependency can contribute towards Imperial objects." Only that, and nothing more.

London, for once, is taking a leading part in the Liberal revival. Of the sixty seats nearly fifty are provided with Liberal candidates. In many of them the contest is hopeless, but the comprehensive character of the battle is expected to have a useful effect in particular instances. The Conservatives are making a determined attack on Battersea, where Mr. John Burns's outspoken hostility to the war has raised him many enemies. Other Liberal seats which are the objects of an exceptionally heavy assault are those at present held by Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Causton, and Mr. Steadman. Some losses are, perhaps, inevitable; but the gains ought to counterbalance them. The organisers, at all events, are very hopeful. To the late Parliament London sent only nine Liberal members. According to some sanguine forecasts that number is about to be more than doubled.

As to the general outlook, the forecasts are various. Mr. Chamberlain has appealed for a greater majority than was obtained by Lord Salisbury five years ago. When the dissolution was first announced, all the prophets were agreed in predicting that he would get it. They are now, quite as unanimously, of a different opinion. The elections, they say, are going to be fairly normal, and that being so, the Government cannot expect to obtain a majority of more than a hundred. But all those speculations are obviously guesswork. Nobody knows what may happen. Lord Salisbury has taken a leap in the dark, and he may either fall pleasantly on his feet or disastrously on his head.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

LORD CURZON'S TOUR.

A FAMINE COMMISSION.

THE NEED OF SEARCHING ENQUIRY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, September 7.

According to the official announcement the Viceroy is about to start on an extensive tour in India which will well-nigh occupy eight weeks before he again reaches the metropolis. To judge from the programme, it is a tour from China to Peru on a small scale. Lord Curzon starts from Simla to visit Kathiawar—a province which, I think, has never be[illegible]ed

by any Viceroy before—comes down to Bombay, visits Hyderabad, then the Madras Presidency, and goes thence to Calcutta by the new East Coast Railway. Practically this is like rounding Cape Comorin. Only a young and energetic Viceroy, much travelled as he is, could go through this big programme. Lord Curzon has chosen a most opportune time. He will have an opportunity of seeing for himself what the country is like after the immediate disappearance of the severest famine on record during the century.

There is to be a grand durbar at Rajkote. Two views may be taken of this *tamasha*. Perhaps one set of politicians may say that it is meet when the most exalted authority in the land, the representative of the Sovereign, sets foot on the soil of Sarushtra—a soil to which no such representative within living memory has been known to come—that he should be received with all the pomp of State. And where pomp and pageantry are concerned it is notorious that our feudatories are lavish, almost to a fault, in point of expenditure. True, say the other set of politicians. That is just the reason why at this juncture these prodigals, who are not only gushing but vie with one another as to who shall make the greatest show of wealth, might be left alone. Almost all of them have so severely suffered from the effects of the famine, still slowly passing away, and have had so many lakhs to borrow, each according to his annual State revenue, from the Government of India, that it would be short-sighted statesmanship which would see them spending a not inconsiderable sum on what must after all be an ephemeral affair. The moral influence of a Viceregal visit need not be depreciated. But it is a question whether that influence can in any way be enhanced by State pageantry. A Viceroy bent on seeing things for himself is certain to leave some permanent mark of his visit on the welfare of the Prince whose territory he sees and of the subjects of that Prince. So that, pageantry or no pageantry, the good work will be done. On the whole it would seem that the second school of politicians, who deprecate lavish expenditure by Native Princes in Kathiawar and elsewhere at the forthcoming Viceregal visit, are not in the wrong. Probably the best way to prevent a waste of money would be for the Viceroy himself to let the Princes know that only the bare expense of a State reception should be incurred, and that according to the real capacity of each State. It will not do to outbid each other, and he might make it known that such outbidding would be viewed with displeasure. A broad hint of this nature would serve a useful purpose.

There was a hint given the other day in the Legislative Council that a Commission would be appointed by the Secretary of State further to enquire into the matter of the last famine. If Lord George Hamilton is really intent this time on full and fair enquiry, it is to be hoped he will see that some independent Indians from each Province of the Empire are appointed. With a Ranade or a Pherozesha from Bombay, a Bonnerjee or a Banerjea from Bengal, a Ragunath Row or a Vira Ragha Chariar (of the Legislative Council) from Madras, a Harnam Sinh from the Punjab, a Bose from the Central Provinces, a vast amount of information might be collected and sifted. Again, the scope of the enquiry must be broad enough. It should go to the very root of the matter. If the root is probed it will be found to be nothing more or less than poverty which is the accumulated effect of the ceaseless drain continued for upwards of a century. There are other causes also. But this will be found to be the cause of causes. We may modify our land revenue policy, we may lighten assessments when they are of the nature of a rack-rent, we may spend many more crores on branch railways and on irrigation works. All these things will undoubtedly contribute in a measure to the improvement of the rayat. They might have the effect of lessening the dire effects of famine in the future. But when all is said as to the divers small improvements in the economic condition of the cultivator, which may be brought about by the means suggested, there will remain this fundamental problem for solution. That is the economic drain. Slowly the people are becoming aware of its disastrous effects. The recent famine has made many a convert here as well as in the United Kingdom. No nation on earth can withstand such a drain of wealth. The final cataclysm must come, however late. History, political or economic, repeats itself. What has happened in the past elsewhere must happen in India. Nature will assert itse[illegible], wh[illegible]r be the artificial stopgaps of humanity. The decline [illegible] of great empires have not come all at once. The decline of Rome really began with Augustus, who brought the Empire to the zenith of political and economic prosperity. But it took four centuries before the Empire crumbled into decay and became the prey of foreign "barbarians." Foreign domination, again, has never prospered, especially domination where the subject population has to submit to an exhausting process, which is now called "bleeding," thanks to Lord Salisbury. Warnings after warnings have been given that the British Indian Government must change its policy, that it must take a radically new departure, and that it must cease gradually, without any violent change, to employ so largely the costly foreign agency which is eating away the vitals of the country. If the policy were changed to-morrow, it would still take 25 years for its complete fruition. But the first five or seven years would tell us how far it was slowly working good. As yet we are crying in the wilderness. As yet Engishmen shrink from looking at the dark side of the shield. If the bright side is to be made brighter still, England must courageously face the black one, examine the spots, and do all in her power to remove them. It is when England has discharged this solemn responsibility towards this unhappy country that the first step in economic reform may be expected. Will England and the English Government prove equal to the occasion? Will they rouse themselves from their lethargy? Will they release themselves from the trammels and the traditions of the white Brahmins of the governing caste in India? Will they cease to talk at large of their Empire-building and Imperialism, and, on the contrary, endeavour to realise that India is a solemn trust vested in them, and that in the degree in which they attempt to discharge that trust and realise their responsibility, will India prosper? Let us hope for a speedy awakening to a sense of this great responsibility. We have still large faith in the genuine Briton and in his spirit of justice. India wants no more. It wants happiness for the millions instead of the present grinding poverty which is grown not only chronic, but daily increases. It is this problem of poverty which the new Commission should solve. All other attempts will be vain. They will be mere make-shifts, destined to end in failure.

We have not yet done with the allegations of "Gujerati." That redoubtable personage is again to come to the fore and hurl back in the official camp the gauntlet thrown down to him. Meanwhile Nemesis seems to dog the footsteps of that authority. For one Mr. Jivanji writes two columns and a half of correspondence in to-day's *Times of India*, where he calmly narrates (a serenity which is in pleasing contrast with the irate pronouncements of Mr. Monteath) the history of his own lands—how he purchased occupancy rights in certain talukas in Surat; how he bought other lands, besides those inherited; how thousands of rupees were spent on improving these lands; and how, in spite of all that energy, intelligence, and enterprise can do, bad seasons and deteriorating soil have played havoc and wrought ruin for him and his family. He then narrates his personal experience of unauthorised, and even of illegal, attempts of the revenue subordinates in the matter of land revenue payments. It makes gruesome reading and presents the land revenue policy of the Bombay Government in a character at which Parliament itself must be shocked. We want a public investigation.

INDIA AND THE GENERAL ELECTION.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION ON THE FORWARD POLICY.

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, in the course of his Address to the electors of the Stirling Burghs, says: Extensions and subjugations may sometimes be necessary, but they are very seldom desirable. I therefore avow that I have no sympathy with the school of writers and speakers which appears for the moment to be dominant, and which sees no glory in the Empire except in aggression and extension. They have been rebuked by two Prime Ministers—Lord Salisbury and Lord Rosebery—who warned us of the danger of undertaking a task beyond our powers, and of the evils of "undigested Empire." The warning has had no effect. Let us hope that when the country sobers down after the excitement of the war our position will present itself more clearly. For, taking the last five years only, what do we see? We have, after a difficult and costly war, rearranged our relations with the turbulent tribes on the North-Western frontier of India, and the Government have reverted to the policy adopted by their predecessors after the Chitral campaign, but reversed by themselves on their accession to office; but recent

events have vividly shown the dangers which lurk both within and beyond the frontier, while that scourges by which India has been visited have tended to cripple her for the task of meeting them.

PROFESSOR MURISON IN GLASGOW.

Professor Murison, in the course of his Address to the electors of the Bridgeton division of Glasgow, says: "I should plead earnestly, on Imperial grounds, for a thorough enquiry into the causes of Indian famines, and for an equitable adjustment of burdens in cases of common interest to Britain and India. I would also claim justice for the oppressed British Indians in South Africa."

The *Glasgow Evening News* (September 22) says: Professor Murison, Bailie Fife, and, of course, the redoubtable Mr. Battersby, were all in vigorous form, and in particular the Professor delivered a rousing speech. Bridgeton's candidate is one of the most effective speakers now in the election field, and last night he quite surpassed himself. At the same time he succeeded in stirring up the opposition element in the meeting, who angrily resented the barbed arrows of his stinging oratory.

[This "opposition element," we are informed, consisted of two persons.]

LORD G. HAMILTON'S ADDRESS.

There is very little reference to India in the address which Lord George Hamilton has issued to the electors of the Ealing Division, but in view of his official position it may be interesting to reproduce the document. He writes:—

"Gentlemen,—Parliament being dissolved, I offer myself for re-election, in the hope that I may continue to receive the confidence which for so many years you have been pleased to give me as your representative in Parliament. The issue before the electors is so clear that it requires but few words to state it. Twenty years ago a majority of the electors of the country gave Mr. Gladstone authority to overturn and reverse the Imperial policy of his rival, Lord Beaconsfield. That unhappy decision has been since then the origin and cause of incalculable mischief and discredit to the people of this country abroad and at home. In almost every sphere of political and legislative work the baneful influence of the Little Englander ideas has been felt and acknowledged. In Ireland, in Central Asia, in the Sudan, and South Africa, the onerous but unavoidable duty has been imposed upon the Unionist Party of counteracting and effacing its calamitous effects. In these exertions the Unionist Party have lately been assisted by a section of their political opponents who have now recognised the error of their former opinions.

"In South Africa the *prestige* and authority of Great Britain have been rehabilitated, but at a terrible cost of suffering and loss of life. The gallantry and determination of our soldiers, drawn from many quarters of the Empire, have surmounted all difficulties, and organised warfare is practically over. We now ask that the completion of the settlement of the South African problem may be entrusted to our hands, and not turned over to that political party whose vacillation and disunion have been, and are still, the main difficulty of the situation. We ask in order that bloodshed may be stayed, and order and tranquillity restored, for such a declaration of opinion as will be regarded both abroad and in South Africa as final and irrevocable.

"During the progress of this war conclusive evidence was afforded by the language and conduct of the Irish Home Rule Party of the grave hazard to which Great Britain would have been exposed had the whole executive power and resources of Ireland been under their control. From this danger the maintenance of the Unionist Party in power alone preserves the Empire.

"The armament and equipment and despatch of 200,000 men to South Africa, without loss of life or serious hitch, is a remarkable feat of administrative ability, and is recognised as such by all who are competent to speak with authority on such matters. Notwithstanding the splendid courage of our soldiers it has been shown that the training of our officers and men, and the organisation of our military system, both regimentally and administratively, require reform and change. Much has been done during the last few years to modernise our army, but stronger and more drastic measures are clearly necessary if we are to profit by the lessons of the last nine months. The task being one of urgent necessity, by whom can it be better performed? By those who have ever taken a keen interest in the soldier's welfare and efficiency, or by that political party whose past performances in military matters have been associated with the production of guns without ammunition varied by the building of forts without guns?

"The growth of our Empire and of our prosperity has not increased our popularity with other countries. Conflict of interests, jealousy, and inherent difference, both of principle and policy, not infrequently crop up in our intercourse with the great Governments abroad. With such skill has Lord Salisbury controlled and minimised these untoward influences that, even in the darkest hours of last winter, there was no tendency to take advantage of our involved position. Such a remarkable exhibition of statesmanship, now that the danger is over, ought not to be forgotten by those whose interests have been so safeguarded. A great external Empire necessarily carries with it many responsibilities and burdens, and until lately their whole weight rested upon the shoulders of the people of this country. Our great self-governing colonies and dependencies now ask to share both the burdens as well as the benefits of that Empire. The splendid story of endurance, gallantry, and victory associated with British arms in South Africa is their heirloom as well as ours. Whilst in the Far East the dash and determination of our Indian troops have once more made known to the world the fighting power and resources which the loyalty and courage of that great dependency can contribute towards Imperial objects.

"Since 1895 much useful legislation has been passed benfiting many sections of our society. The growth of population in towns, and above all in the Metropolis and its suburbs, is producing economic and social problems that require the closest watching and most careful handling. Overcrowding with its multifold evils and the difficulty of providing, under the present system of local taxation, an income adequate to the wants of a growing population, are evils which stand prominently forward and must shortly be faced. To these and other social and industrial questions Parliament can only give the requisite attention when its mind is not distracted by external complications, and, in the interest of these internal problems, it is most desirable that the South African question should be promptly and finally disposed of. It is now thirty-two years since you suddenly and unexpectedly sent me as your representative to Parliament and as a supporter of Lord Beaconsfield. During that long period I can call to mind no serious difference of opinion on any political question between any considerable portion of my supporters and myself. We were then in a hopeless Parliamentary minority; now our opinions are held not only by the vast majority of the House of Commons, but there is a steady and continuous gravitation amongst those nominally opposed to us towards our camp and our flag.

Such a retrospect cannot fail to strengthen and encourage us in the prosecution of the task now before us.—I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your obedient servant, "GEORGE HAMILTON.

"17, Montague Street, Portman Square, W.
"September 22, 1900."

The *Morning Leader* writes (September 26):—

It seems odd to some of us that our Imperialists, in all their spoken and written eloquence, have nothing to say to India—after all, a considerable corner of the Empire. On the assumption that they are ashamed of their treatment of India during the past five years their silence is intelligible. A Government which won seats at the last Election by denouncing the cotton duties and which signalised its success at the polls by permanently occupying Chitral has appropriately followed up these wrongs to the Indian taxpayer by burking enquiry into the causes of recurrent famine, by avoiding the simple measures necessary to give Parliament an intelligent interest in Anglo-Indian finance, and by refusing a national grant either towards the relief of famine or towards the cost of an Imperial war waged beyond the Indian frontier. And that is but part of this Government's record in Indian politics in a period darkened by war, famine, and pestilence. It has also made itself notorious for the lavish use of British Indian troops beyond the borders of India, for its cynical neglect of the claims of Indians in British Colonies, and for a drastic policy of internal repression which has manifested itself in a new law of sedition, repeated Press prosecutions, and the imprisonment of British subjects without trial. Ministers may well ignore what they desire the public to forget. But those of us who try to realise the responsibilities as well as the splendours of Empire may see in the recent history of India the counterpart of recent history at home. This also may help us to answer the question, "Under which king?"

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

3,537,000 ON RELIEF.

"FINE WEATHER WANTED."

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated September 24:—

"Famine. Good general rainfall continues. Rainfall insufficient in few areas in Bombay. Elsewhere fine weather generally is wanted for ripening autumn and sowing winter crops. A further reduction in number on relief works. Prices falling slowly everywhere. On relief: Bombay, 1,074,000; Punjab, 32,000; Central Provinces, 1,597,000; Berar, 195,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 39,000; Rajputana States, 83,000; Central India States, 53,000; Bombay Native States, 122,000; Baroda, 49,000; North-Western Provinces, 1,000; Punjab Native States, 18,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 31,000; Hyderabad, 231,000; Madras, 4,000; Bengal, 1,000. Total, 3,537,000."

The following has been received from the Governor of Bombay:—

"Following are figures for week ending September 15:—Famine-stricken districts, 702 cases of cholera, of which 497 were fatal. Native States—cases of cholera, 1,427, deaths from cholera, 1,028. Total number of deaths among numbers on relief works and gratuitous relief—British districts, 3,589, or 3 3-10 per mille. Rain has continued to fall in light showers over affected area. More rain urgently wanted throughout Bombay, Deccan, and Khandesh.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Indian famine sufferers exceeded on Wednesday night £373,000.

MR. ROMESH DUTT ON OVER-ASSESSMENTS.

The following letter appeared in the *Times* of Monday last:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "[illegible]."

Sir,—I have perused with pleasure the le[illegible] Mr. Glenny and Mr. Rees, both of the Madras Civil Serv[illegible] issues of

September 15 and 21, in reply to my letter which appeared on the 8th. I am glad to find that both your correspondents approve of the idea of an enquiry, suggested in my letter, into the incidence of the land-tax. The question before the public can only be settled by means of such an enquiry, and not by newspaper correspondence.

Mr. Rees very properly alludes to the unwillingness of the British Government to interfere with the administration in Native States "except for the purpose of preventing oppression." There is no evil which is felt more universally by the entire population of a State than an oppressive land-tax; and if the British Government decided to moderate that tax within fixed limits in British territory I have not the least doubt the example would be followed, under British influence, in every Native State in India.

Your correspondents question my statements about over-assessment and the impoverishment of the peasantry in Madras. The matter can be settled, as I have said before, only by enquiry; but I may state here that my statement is supported by the universal opinion of the people of Madras, as also by a mass of high official opinion of undoubted weight. I will not quote from the mass of recorded opinions which I have before me at the present moment—opinions supported by facts and figures—but I may be permitted to quote a line or two from the most recent letters on the subject—those of the distinguished Deputy Collector Dewan Bahadur Raghu Nath Rao—published in recent issues of the *Madras Mail*:—

"I find also some dry lands, assessed variously from above Rs.3 to Rs.5 an acre, cannot bear their assessments. Such lands do pay 75 per cent. of the gross produce and more. . . . I possess dry lands assessed at 6 annas per acre, but I cannot lease them for that sum to any of my tenants, and they have been lying waste. Now, as regards wet lands. . . . According to the theory of this order, the Government share of the produce should not exceed 28 per cent. of the actual gross produce on the highest class, and should not fall below 26 per cent. on the lowest class. But how has this order been carried out? In some cases the assessment not only comes up to 75 per cent., but exceeds that percentage. It is such lands that are lying waste or are often bought by the Government in public auction at one anna (one penny) a lot, sometimes such lots measuring several acres. Some of my lands were thus sold."

This, sir, is not from a professional agitator, but from a distinguished and honoured Government servant—a relative, I believe, of the late Sir T. Madhava Rao, whose work and fame are known to every British Indian administrator. And these are facts which require enquiry.

Mr. Rees argues that assessment is high in Madras because irrigation water has to be paid for. There are extensive irrigation works in Orissa, where I was employed so late as 1896, and we were able to maintain those works and to irrigate miles of country without a compulsory tax. The cultivators paid for the water they used. This system of payment was supported by the Duke of Argyll in his letter of 1870, quoted on page 90 of my book. A compulsory irrigation rate he condemned as mischievous, wasteful, and oppressive. Why should not the same equitable and lenient system which does for Orissa do for Madras also?—Yours faithfully, ROMESH DUTT.

54, Parliament-street, S.W., September 21.

The *Westminster Gazette* said (September 25):—

The news from India on the whole keeps favourable. In most districts of the affected area it is not so much rain as fine weather that is wanted now in order to ripen the autumn crops and allow of the winter crops being sown. The reduction of the number on relief work shows a steady reduction, which it is to be hoped will continue. It is still, however, large enough, the total showing over three millions and a half. Unfortunately the cholera continues its ravages, the deaths in the British districts for the week ending September 15 amounting to 3,589. It has been altogether a terrible year in India, and when the final list of deaths from starvation and cholera comes to be made up it will be appalling in its magnitude. We wish we could think that the experience of recent months will enable steps to be taken which would make these visitations bear less hardly upon our fellow-subjects in the years that are to come. Meantime we would have our readers remember that more money is still urgently wanted for the sufferers—not so much, as the *Standard* correspondent says, for feeding the people as for clothing them:—

> Government undertakes only the feeding, and will not do anything in the way of providing clothes. These are supposed to come from the famine funds. But what are these amongst so many? All told, the amount still falls short of a million sterling, of which a little over a third has been subscribed by Great Britain. Enormous numbers of people have to be clothed and fed, cattle have to be purchased, seed grain and a score of other things provided, all out of this sum of less than a million.

Now that the South African war is at an end and the subscription list connected therewith closed, it is hoped that the continued need of the Indian will not be overlooked.

The *Standard* of Tuesday last printed an article from its Special Correspondent at Simla, dated August 30, in the course of which he said:—

Turning to the various Provinces, we find the outlook in Bombay altogether brighter than has been the case for many long months. Rain has almost everywhere been excellent, even in Scinde, where until a week or so ago there had been none whatever. The great height of the Indus also assists irrigation in that Province. Sowings are progressing favourably, and young crops promise well, though damaged in some districts by heavy rain. Fodder is becoming plentiful, and the cattle still remaining are rapidly improving in condition. These evidences of returning prosperity have induced the grain dealers to lower their prices. There are still more than one and a half millions of people on relief in Bombay, of whom some 600,000 are on gratuitous relief. In the Punjab the rainfall has been somewhat fitful, heavy in places and very light in others. Still, the outlook is on the whole promising. Young crops are doing well, and cattle are everywhere improving. In the Central Provinces there has been almost too much rain in many districts, and the people are crying out for a break in the monsoon. The famine figures for these Province furnish some remarkable reading. There are some 2¼ millions on relief, of whom no fewer than 2,000,000 are in receipt of gratuitous relief, 760,000 of these being adults and 961,000 children relieved in kitchens. The policy obtaining in the Central Provinces is to send the natives away to their homes immediately upon the outbreak of the rains, and there maintain them gratuitously until the crops ripen. There is this much to be said for the plan, that they obtain an amount of shelter in their homes which they certainly would not get in the relief camps, and so outbreaks of disease, and the devastating fevers which follow on prolonged exposure, are avoided. On the other hand, the gratuitous feeding for many weeks on end of 2,000,000 people, many of them strong and well-to-do, must have a disastrous effect on their *moral*. In Berar prospects are very hopeful, the rainfall having been good, and the monsoon crops promise well. There being abundant fodder now, the cattle are doing well. In Hyderabad, too, the outlook is much brighter, rain having fallen in sufficient quantities almost everywhere. There has been good rain throughout Rajputana, where the monsoon agricultural operations are now practically completed. Standing crops are doing well, and the cattle rapidly improving in condition. In the remaining famine districts things are equally promising.

The rainfall up to the time of writing presents some curious features. Most of the Bombay districts have received amounts considerably in excess of the normal, the Bombay Deccan showing more than 60 per cent.; Kathiawar, 47 per cent.; Khandesh, 30 per cent.; and other districts smaller amounts in excess. Scinde and the Baluchistan hills show defective rainfall; but in the case of this part of India the total fall is so slight that a single good shower will convert the deficiency into a surplus. The whole of the Punjab, except the Western portion, shows either normal or excess rain, as do the Central Provinces. In Rajputana, as a whole, there has been a slight deficiency, but this is being rapidly made good by the heavy falls of the last few days. Thus we have the whole of the famine area with either a large excess of rain, or, at least, a fairly normal amount. In Bengal and the North-West Provinces, however, parts of India which were not in the least affected by the famine of the last year, there has been a very serious deficiency in rainfall this year. Every district of the North-west shows a considerable deficit, averaging about 30 per cent. In every district, too, of Bengal and Assam, with the single exception of Orissa, a lack of rain is reported. The condition of many of these districts is already beginning to cause anxiety, and it is possible that relief operations on a small scale may have to be started in some places. Thus we have the curious feature presented to us of the famine tracts receiving plenteous rain, while that part of the country which last year was blessed with bumper crops is now threatened with serious scarcity.

Piteous accounts continue to come from the Bhil country. The missionaries and officials are doing their best to save the people, but the mortality is, nevertheless, terrible. This mortality has been considerably increased by the arrival of the monsoon. The people possess only a few threadbare rags in the way of clothes—scarcely enough to make up a loincloth. Of bedding they have none, and the constant exposure to wet and damp, together with the ill-effects resulting from sleeping night after night on the cold ground, bring on diseases from which the people, weakened by a year of severe famine, have not sufficient stamina to recover. The country side is simply littered with corpses. It is the rule and not the exception for a dozen or more to be collected every morning round the Mission stations, while a journey across country reveals the fact that thousands are dying every week from exposure and the after-effects of famine. More money is urgently required, not so much for feeding the people as for clothing them. Government undertakes only the feeding, and will not do anything in the way of providing clothes. These are supposed to come from the famine funds. But what are these amongst so many? All told, the amount still falls short of a million sterling, of which a little over a third has been subscribed by Great Britain.

The *Investors' Review* (September 22) writes:—

For the last three weeks no money has been sent in to our little famine fund. We have felt ashamed to draw attention to the fact, and waited with a faint hope that the wants of the Indian people had not been altogether forgotten. Now that the excitement of a General Election is on us, we fear this hope must for the present be abandoned; but we cannot really blame readers for thinking that there is no necessity to subscribe further money. The Secretary of State for India continues to suppress the ugly side of this appalling scourge in India, and the figures of the numbers of the starving on the relief work steadily decline. For the past week they came down to 3,884,000, and it is natural enough to infer that the decline means a speedy end of the distress. Unfortunately it does nothing of the kind. Although the numbers on works have decreased, the Governor of Bombay points out that the numbers on gratuitous relief in that province increase, and at the same time the ravages from disease are becoming more terrible. We do not get the figures as to these from the whole of the famine stricken districts, it would not be wise to publish them, but in Bombay and the Native States, in a sense tributary thereto, in the week ending September 8, the deaths from cholera amounted to 2,464. The total number of the deaths among numbers on relief works and receiving gratuitous relief in British districts was 3,902, or 3⅝ per thousand. All past experience warns us that these figures are probably much short of the truth, and they mean, in any case, that famine is having its usual results in the decimation of the population. The present generation will not live to see the effects of this overwhelming disaster obliterated in some of the afflicted districts. What can we say more? Does England wish to leave India to die? Are we satisfied to exchange it for a wasted South Africa, where famine also rears its ghoulish head? The present amount of our little fund is £851 10s. 7d., and at least until the end of the present year, subscriptions by cheque or otherwise—and if by cheque, crossed Union Bank of London Indian Famine Fund—will always be thankfully and gratefully received by A. J. Wilson.

REVENUE COLLECTIONS IN GUZARAT.

The following letter to the editor appeared in the *Times of India* of September 8 last:—

Sir,—In Government Resolution No 3161 of 22nd August, 1900, of the Famine Department and its annexures, they speak of organised opposition to the levy of assessment from people well able to pay it, and insinuations and allegations are made against me as if I were a leader of such opposition in my part of the country.

In Ankleshwur, Hansot, and Orpad there is no opposition to the levy of Government dues, and much less any organised opposition. The cry of opposition is untruly raised by the subordinate Revenue officials with the object of justifying their oppression and illegal proceedings. I emphatically say that I have never been concerned in any opposition whether organised or not, and no information of any such opposition has ever come to my knowledge. I am cognisant that I am disliked by the Native Revenue officials because, unfortunately for me, ignorant people of many villages of Hausot and Orpad consider that I am a man of intelligence and information, and that I am a good adviser in their times of difficulty. When poor and ignorant people are oppressed or improperly harassed by the lower officials I consider it my duty to help them in conveying their grievances to superior officers, and in exposing the actions of their oppressors. A man of this kind would naturally be looked upon with feelings of hatred and aversion by such officials as think that it is their privilege to harass and annoy illiterate and ignorant people with impunity.

My family has been an agriculturist family for several generations. Till 1887 I and my brother Eduljee, who has been joint with me, possessed lands paying an annual assessment of about Rs. 4,000. We had also traded in cotton and had acquired money in that business. In 1887 we thought that the cotton trade was very risky, and that if we persisted in it we might lose what we had acquired. We were desirous of placing our moneys in investments that might be safe and most secure. We thought that if our moneys were put in agricultural lands that would be an investment of that character. In consequence of this idea we purchased in that year occupancy rights in 800 acres of land at Togapur in the Mandvi Taluka of Surat, bearing an annual assessment of Rs. 1,600 for Rs. 4,000, and we spent about Rs. 10,000 in improving these lands and making them fit for cultivation, and we purchased about 200 acres of land at the villages of Pardi, Asnar, Sarsana, Kachale, Kadrama, Simulthu of the Orpad Taluka, bearing an annual assessment of about Rs. 800, also for Rs. 4,000, and spent about Rs. 5,000 in improving them and making them fit for cultivation. We also purchased occupancy rights in 75 acres of land of Nagar (Ankleshwur Taluka), bearing an annual assessment of Rs. 312, and 400 acres of land at Sisodra (Ankleshwur Taluka), bearing an annual assessment of Rs. 1,800 for Rs. 2,000. In this manner we two brothers since 1887 held ancestral and purchased lands bearing an annual assessment of Rs. 9,000.

Our lands brought ruin on us, in the same way as they have brought ruin on many big landholders in this part of the country. In 1888 all our cash was exhausted, and for the purpose of paying the Government dues and carrying on agricultural operations we had to incur debts and mortgage some of our lands. From 1888 to 1895, in consequence of bad outturns, we had to incur fresh debts and mortgage more properties every year. In 1896 also, by reason of bad outturn, we were not able to procure moneys sufficient to pay in full the Government assessment even on the security of mortgages; and notwithstanding all our efforts to pay off the Government dues, about Rs. 1,500 remained due against us at the end of 1895-96. We explained our circumstances to the then Collector of Broach, and he was pleased to extend the time for the payment of the sum till the season of the following year. The outturn of 1897-98 also was bad, and we relinquished in that year about a hundred acres of the Togapur lands and about 100 acres of the Sisodra lands. We no doubt duly paid the balance of the previous year. But at the end of the year we remained indebted to Government to the extent of Rs. 2,800. The then Collector on our representation was pleased to extend the time of the payment to the season of the following year. In 1897-98 we relinquished about 650 acres of Togapur land and about 200 acres of the Sisodra land. The outturn of the year was exceedingly poor. At the end of the year we remained indebted to Government to the extent of Rs. 4,500. We applied to the Collector of Broach to grant us remission or in any case to extend the time for payment. The Collector ordered enquiries, and in the end the Mamlatdar reported that the outturn could not even cover the cost of cultivation, exclusive of the Government assessment. The Collector was, therefore, pleased to extend the time of payment till February, 1899.

The year 1898-99 also proved a bad one. In consequence of a very severe frost the crops almost failed, and in February, 1899, we found ourselves quite unable to pay the balance of the previous year. We applied for payment by instalments, and offered to pay interest on the balance, and give such security as may be acceptable to the Collector for the due payment of the instalments. But the Collector showed us no favour on this occasion. He immediately ordered the forfeiture of all our Sisodra lands; they were also put up for auction sale. But, probably in consequence of very hard times in the district, they did not then find a bidder.

The Sisodra lands remaining unsold, further coercive measures were resorted to. Our moveable property, including even the beddings and the grain for the maintenance of our families, and twenty-six bullocks required for our agricultural operations, were attached and taken away; our houses were attached, the occupants were removed from them; tenants were removed during the terms of their tenancy; and an attempt was made to remove from our house our old mother who was lying ill.

In the month of May, 1899, both I and my brother Eduljee were required to attend before the Collector of Broach. The Collector said that he would there and then order our arrest. We offered to give satisfactory securities for the payment of our Government dues. The Collector required us to give four securities, and we accordingly gave four securities; each of them was worth far more than the amount we owed which each of them assured.

Under Rule 64 of the rules made by the Bombay Government, under Section 214 of the Land Revenue Code, when a holding is forfeited in payment of the land revenue due thereupon, and is not sold, the arrears payable by the defaulter shall ordinarily be remitted without having recourse to further compulsory process against him. In special cases the Collector, with the sanction of the Commissioner, is authorised to enforce the right of recovering the arrears by other means. In our case the attachment of the moveable and immoveable property, and our arrest, were made without any sanction of the Commissioner, and therefore unauthorised. Again, the plough cattle, beddings, and grain were legally unattachable, and their attachment was improper.

Again, as we had given security under Section 164 of the Bombay Land Revenue Code, the execution of all processes against us ought to have been stayed. The lands that had been forfeited and the attached moveable and immoveable property should also have been restored to us.

Our forfeited lands were, however, not restored to us. Government retained the possession of our houses, and our moveable properties were not only not restored to us, but they were actually sold away after the security bonds were passed. I accordingly made a representation to the Commissioner, N.D., against these illegal acts of the District Officers.

After I had submitted my representation to the Commissioner we received intimations from the village officers that we were restrained from cultivating all our lands of the Hansot Mahal (besides the Sisodra lands), in respect of which we had actually paid the Government dues, and we were given a written intimation that if we attempted to enter upon any of these lands we would be prosecuted criminally for trespass. Under the circumstances we were prevented by the act of Government officials from cultivating any of our lands of the Hansot Mahal.

This prohibition continued as late as October, 1899, when it was withdrawn with respect to lands other than those of Sisodra. Subsequently, in the month of April last, we received an intimation that with reference to all our lands in Hansot, we might pay the Government dues thereon the next year. In reply to that intimation we answered that as we had been improperly prevented from cultivating, our lands had not only ceased to be liable for the Government dues, but that, on the other hand, we hold Government liable to us for damages for their illegal obstructions. We intend shortly to give Government notice of action in the matter.

In consequence of my application to the Commissioner, that officer got an appraisement of the Sisodra lands that had been forfeited to be made by the Mamlatdar of Ankleshwur. We valued the lands at about Rs. 30,000. The Mamlatdar, however, valued it at Rs. 11,000. Even accepting the Mamlatdar's appraisement, the lands forfeited were worth more than double the amount that we owed to Government. The Commissioner consequently in his letter No. 537 of February 17 last, suggested that no further steps should be taken. He sanctioned retrospectively the attachment and sale of the moveable property, and directed that the security bond should be cancelled. You will thus see that with reference to our lands in the Hansot Mahal we are at present no defaulters.

From what I have stated you will understand that we are among the greatest sufferers from the deterioration of soil and the unfavourableness of the seasons; that our conduct does not indicate the slightest contumacy on our part. For our Orpad lands we have paid assessments in full till the year 1898-99 inclusive. In 1899-1900 most of my lands remained untilled, and the few that were cultivated yielded the most scanty outturn. We had paid about half of the assessment for the year. But we were unable to pay the rest. We applied to the Collector to suspend the payment of the unpaid part. The Mamlatdar was deputed to make enquiries. He made the necessary enquiries, and was satisfied that ours was a proper case for suspension. He gave me to understand that he would recommend that our application for suspension should be allowed. We have hitherto received no information of our application for suspension being not allowed. We do not pretend that we are rich. We have been reduced to poverty, and have become largely indebted; but our poverty and indebtedness have not been owing to any fault on our part. They have been caused by high assessments, the deterioration of the soil, and many bad seasons consecutively following each other. We have paid over a lakh of rupees in the form of assessment over and above the money paid for occupancy rights. We are not defaulters in the sense ordinarily understood, and certainly not contumacious defaulters. We are exceedingly sorry that high officers of Government should have allowed themselves to be misled by the subordinates in applying such degrading epithets to us.

With reference to myself—Jivanjee——though I am very unwilling, I am forced to say a few words about myself. I have for many years taken much interest in matters of public welfare. From the time that the elective franchise was given to land-holding classes I have continuously been an elected member of the Taluka Local Board of Ankleshwur, and the members of the Local Board, official and non-official, have during the last thirteen years continuously and unanimously elected me to represent it in the District Local Board. I have been nominated by Government a member of the Village Sanitation Board, and my advice and suggestions were called for by Government in the framing of the rules under the Village Sanitation Act. When cholera broke out in the Hansot Mahal and Ankleshwur Taluka, and when there was no dispensary there, I, at my own expense, got a qualified medical man from Surat and supplied medicines. During all epidemics in any Taluka I have taken a prominent part in helping the authorities and assisting in alleviating the distress of the sufferers. While plague was raging in Kaliajal and other villages of the Hansot Mahal, I was appointed the chief plague authority of the place. The District Magistrate wrote, in appointing me to the chief plague authority, that I "should go to the village to reside and superintend with my usual *vigour and energy* all the measures taken for stamping out the plague from there."

I was requested to assess the value of infected houses and huts that it was thought desirable to burn, with the aid of the village *Panch*. I went and resided at Kaliajal, and I superintended the plague operations there very effectually. I got myself first inoculated with plague prophylactic at a time when most people had strong prejudices against it, with the object of inspiring confidence in the measures; and I got 700 people to leave their houses without the slightest friction, and I also got them inoculated. My own community have confidence in me, and the Parsee Punchayet distribute their charity funds in Ilav and in other adjacent places through me. Though not at all rich, I have distributed a quantity of grain of mine in the Mahal for the purpose of saving the poor from starvation. The Mamlatdar of Orpad, in his letter of June 23, tells me "I hear you are distributing grain among poor cultivators. I shall, therefore, place these people on dole when you cease doing so." In my relations with Government on one occasion I let go a sum of Rs. 3,000 to which I had become entitled under a decree of Court. I willingly allowed myself to suffer a loss of about a thousand rupees in connexion with a contract for supply of hay to the Government troops passing through the district, when I might easily have recovered the money by suing Government, or threatening by notice to sue them.

I have now to ask whether a person of my position, habits, and precedents, is likely to take a prominent part, or to mix in any conspiracy or unlawful agitation. I must be credited with common-sense. I am a large land-holder in very impoverished circumstances. Government have been kind in showing favour to me in granting suspensions. After the very sensible order of the Commissioner, I have not much ground to complain of against my treatment. My circumstances would render it necessary that I should need the favour of Government for some years more. My difficulties have not been the difficulties of a single year, and it would be evidently opposed to my interests and ungrateful on my part to mix in measures which appear to be harmful to the real interests of the Government.

But I know full well that Government do not wish that their subjects should be oppressed by their lower subordinate officials, and I submit that I am rendering them no disservice if I expose such of them as are acting illegally or contrary to their express wishes and intentions.

In two cases when I found that the district authorities did not much mind enquiring into the action of their subordinates, and that they were prepared to accept any explanations that they gave, I advised a resort to the Civil Court. But even in this I understood that I was helping Government, and what has happened has justified me in my ruins. Instead of making independent enquiries in connexion with the grievances of the poor, they merely accepted the statements of those who have been charged with improper conduct. Under the circumstances, a suit in a Civil Court was one of the most effective and constitutional ways of bringing the grievances to the notice of the higher officers of Government.

In connexion with the case of Bai Mani, wife of Purshotam Dullabh, who was turned out of her house, whose property was attached, whose person was searched under circumstances of great indignity, the defence of the subordinate officers is that a false petition had been sent in her name, but that it was not hers, that she never mentioned about her ill-treatment to her husband, and that I threatened her with prosecution if she changed her statement. The Mahalkari sent for Mani as well as her husband on the 25th of July last. She was required to say that no petition was sent by her. She, however, persisted in saying that she would not deny the sending of the petition. Now I ask whether it was not most improper on the part of the Mahalkari to have ignored the fact altogether. Then if the fact was that her petition was disowned by her on the first occasion, why was it that the articles attached from her person were returned to her without any payment? Then, if she persisted before the Mahalkari in saying that she could not deny the fact of her making the petition she would not have stated to her husband that she made no petition. On the other hand, when Purshotam is made to say that Jivanjee told her that he had arranged to have the question of her petition kept open, it means that he knew that his wife had made the petition, and that even after the return of the property, there remained some grievance unredressed. Efforts were made on the 25th July last, and also about the time that the petition was submitted, to induce Mani to deny her making of the petition. If there is one portion of the alleged statement of Purshotam before the Mahalkari which cannot but be false, it is impossible to accept the other parts. There is something very suspicious in connexion with the statement in the first report that Mani's petition was anonymous, and also in connexion with the alleged statement of Purshotam. I emphatically say that I never threatened Mani by telling her that she would be prosecuted if she changed her statement. When the worthlessness of the two pieces of evidence on which the Mahalkari bases his defence is considered it is impossible to say that any of the statements in Mani's petition to the Collector were untrue. If I then assisted her in getting a petition to the Collector to be prepared against the improper conduct of the Talati, I submit that it would be wrong to say that I did anything which the most loyal of her Majesty's subjects ought not to have done.

With reference to the case of the Saval Mody, the Mody says that he told the Talati immediately on his demanding the money that no balance was due from him in the village account; that the book, when shown to the Talati, showed that the account had been closed three years back. The case of the Talati from the Mahalkari's report appears to be that the debit entry did not exist when the book was shown to him first, that the Mody admitted the debt and the making of the entry and the denial of the debt were subsequent. I can satisfactorily show that the Mody's statement is considerably more trustworthy and probable than the Talati's, but it is unnecessary to enter into the merits of the question. For my purpose the question whether the Talati's or the Mody's account is true need not be discussed. The Mody was no registered occupant of Government lands, and he was not in possession of any Government lands. The Talati had no right under the law to distrain the Mody's property. When the Mody said that he owed nothing to the defaulter, or even if he had said that he was not able to pay, there ought to have been an end of the matter then. He had no right to attach the property. If the money was really due from the Mody he ought to have reported the matter to his superiors and induced them to bring a suit; the Talati's action in taking the law in his own hands was entirely illegal and improper; and the conduct of a man who advises the bringing of a suit under the circumstances in one of the judicial tribunals of the country is by no means reprehensible, and such a high officer as a Deputy Collector, who uses most objectionable names with reference to a person because he advised a suit, is, I submit, deserving of the greatest censure from Government. It may be the law of the Deputy Collectors who see no illegality in the acts such as that of the Obha Talati, to treat the giving of notice of suit against Government as a criminal offence punishable under Sections 182 and 189 of Indian Penal Code. But I am not aware of any such law. I never knew of the intended prosecution when the Mody's suit was filed; but when a Government officer goes the length of attempting to use the machinery of the Criminal Courts for purposes like these, it would not at all be surprising if people who would be unwilling to go to litigation feel themselves compelled to bring suits against Government.

With respect to the case of Bai Soona I would not like to say much. It is the case in which Mr. Upasani gave the judgment which appeared in your paper about a month ago. The practice of opening locked houses in the absence of their owners by the village officers is illegal and opposed to the express orders of the Government. It may lead to property of villagers being stolen. The accused was discharged on merely technical grounds. The Mahalkari was wrong in saying that no other like Soona's has occurred in the Mahal. I ask if a person treated in the way in which Soona was treated in order that legal proceedings might be instituted ought to be denounced for his service as if he was an enemy of Government. The Mahalkari says that I bear ill-will towards the Obha Talati because he had ventured to obtain a purchaser for my Doongra lands. But the facts in reference to the Doongra lands were that I and my brother wanted to pay the Government revenue, and not that we did not want to pay. The Doongra lands had been mortgaged to me and my brother. The mortgagor was in actual possession, and was also the registered occupant. The mortgagor made default, and with the object of depriving us of our rights, mortgagees got the property collectively forfeited and sold, and it was purchased or going to be purchased by the Moslem bidder referred to by the Mahalkari. When this fact came to our knowledge we complained that if notice had been served on us we would have paid the Government and let the lands in our possession. We were not, till the publication of the Mahalkari's report, aware of any understanding between the Talati and the Moslem bidder. In the Doongra sale, if the Talati was working in the manner mentioned by the Mahalkari, I do not think he was helping the interests of the Government. He was, on the other hand, working against them. Mr. Kadri in his report speaks about my being notorious for my *khatpat* in official matters. "He tried his best to secure the Patelship of Umrachi for one of his Rajput candidates, but in the interest of the public service and justice to the people it was given to an outsider with the Collector's approval." Mr. Kadri's statement about *khatpat* on my part is absolutely false. I have enough troubles of my own, enough of what I consider my public duties, to give any time or attention to underhand intriguings for other persons. An intriguer would always try to remain in favour with all classes of Government officials. If I had been a leader of intrigues I would not have ventured to do things which must necessarily put me in disfavour with officers of all classes, from the Talati upwards. The insinuation that I had anything to do with the appointment of the Umrachi Patelship is baseless and unfounded. There were several candidates for the Patelship. I am quite unable to understand what person he means by my Rajput candidate. The present Patel has always been friendly to me. If he means by my candidate the nephew of the late Patel he was never more friendly to me than the person who has been appointed. Mr. Kadri cannot be unaware of the fact that there was no real rivalry between the nephew and the present incumbent of the Patelship, who is the late Patel's wife's brother. When Mr. Kadri appointed the present Patel, he, having no lands in the village, wanted some lands to be transferred to his name for the purpose of qualifying him to the Patelship, and it was this nephew who got his lands transferred to the name of the successful man. Though both of them were applicants they were working jointly, indifferent as between them of the success of either with the object of excluding candidates of the opposite faction.

Mr. Kadri then insinuates that I am working for securing a remission for myself in the names of poor Kolis and Rajputs. This insinuation, too, I emphatically repudiate. I do not hold any lands in mortgage from Rajputs or Kolis, nor am I otherwise interested in the lands of these people. There are insinuations and allegations here and there that I and the other Parsees of Ilav made the rayats to understand that the arrears were to be remitted in the end, and that it was to the benefits of the rayats in other ways not to pay the Government. It is not stated who offered the persuasion, and to whom, and when, and where. It is impossible in the absence of any specific statement to refute this except by stating that I myself never induced any person to withhold the payment of Government revenues, nor has it ever come to my knowledge that such inducement was made by any other person.

I have thus answered allegations relating to myself. As regards the fact mentioned by your correspondent "Guzerati," they will be answered by him or by the Hon. Mr. Gokuldas K. Parekh, who had been there for the purpose of making local enquiry, and has in his possession a large mass of evidence to support the statement of "Guzerati."

I have to apologise to you for this very long letter. I never intended to make it so long. Considering, however, the gravity of the insinuations against me, I trust that you will be pleased to give place to it in your columns.

Bombay, September 6, 1900. JIVANJEE LIMJIBHAI.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOKS.

Nos. I., II., & III. NOW READY.

I. **THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST,** By Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., M.P. (being a Series of Suggestions for the Prevention of Famine in India). Price 7d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., 7 annas.

II. **ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE:** Evidence-in-Chief of the Five Indian Witnesses. Price 1s. 10d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., R. 1. 4.

III. **THE PROPOSED SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES IN INDIA.** Memorial to the Secretary of State for India. With Two Appendices. Price 1s. 2d., post free; in India, by V.V.P., 14 annas.

London: Published by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, S.W.

In India: Copies may be obtained from D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.

Open Letters to Lord Curzon
ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

By ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

London: Kegan Paul & Co., price 7/6. Obtainable in India through any bookseller.

"Mr. R. C. Dutt's volume is extremely opportune at the present time, and his position, that an excessive land tax renders the agricultural population unable to face two or three successive years of drought, calls at least for careful examination. . . . . Mr. Dutt is on less debatable ground in pleading for a reduction of the annual drain to England and for the more extended mployment of the Indians in civil employ."—*The Times.*

"Mr. Dutt succeeds in showing that, on the whole, areas of recurrent famine have been identical with those of excessive assessment."—*The Daily News.*

"Nothing could be better than the book on Indian Famines which Mr. Dutt has just published in the form of some Open Letters to Lord Curzon. It is thoroughly informed, well-reasoned, and temperate; it tells the inquiring man exactly what he ought to know."—*The Daily Chronicle.*

"We would draw special attention to Mr. Dutt's own convincing and eloquent plea, hidden away in the final pages of the appendix, for the creation of such representative institutions as should enable the Government of India to utilise native services and keep abreast of native opinion."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

"His recommendations are that the land tax should be moderated, that irrigation works should be constructed, and tha the public debt and the public expenditure of India should be reduced. These proposals he supports with a wealth of detail of all kinds, which proves his mastery of the subject and makes good his claim to the attention of the governing authorities." *The World.*

"His view that it is inequitable to make India pay for the maintenance of a large army to be used for the general purposes of the Empire has the support of many high authorities who are by no means to be described as Little Englanders."—*Literature.*

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London. In India to B. C. Ghose, Esq., M.A., Lecturer, City College, Calcutta, who will furnish further particulars.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address. The services of a recent visitor to the Famine districts are available.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, THE SECRETARY,
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. Venor says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very seful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1900.
VOL. XIII.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "India," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897). Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898), XI. (Jan.-June, 1899), XII. (July-Dec., 1899). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "India,"
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.